

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

YUNG LO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ETT GAMING, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01887-APG-PAL

ORDER

(Mot. Definite Doc. – Dkt. #66)

(Response to OSC – Dkt. #67)

(Mot. re: Truth of File – Dkt. #68)

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Yung Lo’s “Motion for Definite Document” (Dkt. #66); “Motion Regarding Truth of File to Appeal Court” (Dkt. #68);¹ and Response (Dkt. #67) to the Court’s Order to Show Cause (Dkt. #65). Both Motions and the Response were filed November 2, 2015. The response to the order to show cause provides some additional details about her claims. Dkt #66 states limited appointed counsel, Mr. Kemp, did not tell her about the stipulation and order requiring a more definite statement if the ENE did not settle the case.

The other motion also appears to be her attempts to provide additional details regarding her claims against Defendants. The court is satisfied that sanctions are not warranted for her failure to timely comply with the court’s prior order to provide a more definite statement.

The Court construes her filings (Dkt. ## 66, 67 & 68) as her attempt to show cause and provide a more definite statement concerning her Complaint allegations and claims (Dkt. #5).

///

///

///

///

¹ Neither of Ms. Lo’s “motions” contain requests for relief from the Court, therefore, they cannot be granted or denied.

1 **IT IS ORDERED** Defendants shall treat Plaintiff's filings (Dkt #66, 67 & 68) as her
2 more definite statement and may file any motion deemed appropriate in response.

3 Dated this 12th day of November, 2015.

4
5 
6 PEGGY A. LEEN
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28